

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS Washington, D.C. 20231 www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. | |
|--------------------------------------|-----------------|----------------------|-------------------------|------------------|--|
| 09/973,098 | 10/09/2001 | Patrick L. Sullivan | 10001-25890B 7222 | | |
| | 7590 03/13/2002 | | | | |
| Joseph F. Marinelli | | | EXAMINER | | |
| Jenner & Block, LLC One IBM Plaza | | | DINH, TUAN T | | |
| Chicago, IL | 50611 | | ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER | | |
| | | 2827 | | | |
| | | | DATE MAILED: 03/13/2002 | | |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

| | | | | 1 | W | | | | |
|---|--|------------------------|---|---|---|--|--|--|--|
| <i>t</i> , | | Application No. | | Applicant(s) | V | | | | |
| | • | 09/973,098 | | SULLIVAN ET AL | | | | | |
| Ç. | Office Action Summary | Examiner | | Art Unit | | | | | |
| | | Tuan T Dinh | | 2827 | | | | | |
| The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address | | | | | | | | | |
| Period for Reply A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM | | | | | | | | | |
| THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). - Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). Status | | | | | | | | | |
| 1)⊠ | Responsive to communication(s) filed on 09 (| <u> October 2001</u> . | | | | | | | |
| 2a) <u></u> | This action is FINAL . 2b)⊠ This action is non-final. | | | | | | | | |
| , | 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213. | | | | | | | | |
| Disposition of Claims | | | | | | | | | |
| 4)[⊻ | 4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-26</u> is/are pending in the application. | | | | | | | | |
| _,_ | 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration. | | | | | | | | |
| , | 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. | | | | | | | | |
| • | Claim(s) <u>1-26</u> is/are rejected. | | | | | | | | |
| | Claim(s) is/are objected to. | | | | | | | | |
| 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement. Application Papers | | | | | | | | | |
| 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner. | | | | | | | | | |
| 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner. | | | | | | | | | |
| Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). | | | | | | | | | |
| 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner. | | | | | | | | | |
| If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action. | | | | | | | | | |
| 12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. | | | | | | | | | |
| Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120 | | | | | | | | | |
| 13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). | | | | | | | | | |
| a) All b) Some * c) None of: | | | | | | | | | |
| | 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. | | | | | | | | |
| | 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No | | | | | | | | |
| 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. | | | | | | | | | |
| 14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application). | | | | | | | | | |
| a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received. 15)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121. | | | | | | | | | |
| Attachment(s) | | | | | | | | | |
| 2) No | tice of References Cited (PTO-892) tice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) ormation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _ | 4) [5) [6) [| • | (PTO-413) Paper No Patent Application (P | | | | | |

Application/Control Number: 09/973,098

Art Unit: 2827

DETAILED ACTION

Double Patenting

1. A rejection based on double patenting of the "same invention" type finds its support in the language of **35 U.S.C. 101** which states that "whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process ... may obtain <u>a</u> patent therefor ..." (Emphasis added). Thus, the term "same invention," in this context, means an invention drawn to identical subject matter. See *Miller v. Eagle Mfg. Co.*, 151 U.S. 186 (1894); *In re Ockert*, 245 F.2d 467, 114 USPQ 330 (CCPA 1957); and *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970).

A statutory type (35 U.S.C. 101) double patenting rejection can be overcome by canceling or amending the conflicting claims so they are no longer coextensive in scope. The filing of a terminal disclaimer <u>cannot</u> overcome a double patenting rejection based upon 35 U.S.C. 101.

- 2. Claims 1-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 as claiming the same invention as that of claims 1-25 of prior U.S. Patent No. 6,620,744. This is a double patenting rejection.
- 3. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970);and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

4. Claim 26 is provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1 = of \$\frac{\tag{20}}{3/9/62}\$

Application/Control Number: 09/973,098

Art Unit: 2827

copending Application No. 6,320,744. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the limitations of claim 1 in U. S. Patent 6,320,744 encompass the limitations of instant claim 26, and has an additional limitation of heat transfer means. The heat transfer means can be replace with a plurality of ventilation holes in an installation frame in order to release heat from units or modules in store in the frame.

This is a <u>provisional</u> obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

Allowable Subject Matter

5. Claims 1-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 as claiming the same invention as that of claims 1-25 of prior U.S. Patent No. 6,620,744. claim 26 is obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-19 of copending Application No. 6,320,744. Examiner requests applicant to file a terminal disclaimer; therefore, claim 26 would be patentable over claims 1-19 of U.S. Patent 6,620,744. can be allowed.

Conclusion

6. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Welch et al., and Dague et al. disclose related art.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Tuan T Dinh whose telephone number is 703-306-5856. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David L. Talbott can be reached on 703-305-9883. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-305-1341 for regular communications and 703-305-1341 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-0956.

TD March 9, 2002

Kluneo Primary Examiner